

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-35 are pending in this application, with claims 1-7, 16, 25 and 33-35 being independent. Claims 7, 10-13, 19-22, 25, 27-30 and 33-35 have been amended.

Claims 13, 22 and 30 have been rejected under section 112, first and second paragraphs, for failure of the specification to provide enabling support for "verifying, by the server or the first server, that the portable information equipment is disposed at a visible position." Claims 13 and 22 have been amended to recite "verifying, by the server, that the portable information equipment is disposed at a position at which the display device is visible," and claim 30 has been amended to recite "verifying, by the first server, that the portable information equipment is disposed at a position at which the display device is visible." Applicant respectfully submits that this aspect of the claims is supported by the specification at, for example, page 9, lines 18-23, which indicates that "the system can verify that the person who wants to have information displayed on the display device C is actually in a position where the information displayed on the display device C can be viewed." Accordingly, in view of the amendments and remarks above, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 33 and 34 have been rejected as being anticipated by McAuliffe (U.S. Patent No. 5,838,790). With respect to claim 33, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because McAuliffe does not describe or suggest having a server send a commercial advertisement or a public service announcement stored in a database to a display device and having the display device display the commercial advertisement or the public service announcement when the server does not receive a search signal from portable information equipment, as recited in claim 33. The Examiner points to col. 4, line 35 to col. 5, line 67 of McAuliffe as showing the subject matter of claim 33. However, this passage does not appear to describe or suggest portable information equipment, and also does not describe or suggest having a display device display a commercial advertisement or a public service announcement when a server does not receive a search signal from the portable information equipment.

Stated differently, the client computer 2 of McAuliffe cannot constitute the recited server because it does not receive a search signal from portable information equipment and does not include a mechanism for causing the display device to display a commercial advertisement or a public service announcement when such a search signal is not received. Similarly, the server computer 4 of McAuliffe cannot constitute the recited server because it does not send a commercial advertisement or a public service announcement to the display device and, like the computer 2, does not receive a search signal from the portable information equipment and does not include a mechanism for causing the display device to display a commercial advertisement or a public service announcement when such a search signal is not received.

With respect to claim 34, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because McAuliffe does not describe or suggest having a server send an advertisement to a display device in the manner recited in the claim. The Examiner points to col. 5, lines 17-67 of McAuliffe as showing the subject matter of claim 34. However, the client computer 2 of McAuliffe cannot constitute the recited server because it does not charge a sponsor, and the server computer 4 of McAuliffe cannot constitute the recited server because it does not send information to a display device.

For the reasons presented above, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 2 and 4 have been rejected as being anticipated by Bennett (U.S. Patent No. 6,615,172). Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because Bennett does not describe or suggest a display device that receives information sent by a server, as recited in each of claims 2 and 4.

The action indicates that Bennett shows having the server 180 send information to the display device at col. 10, line 54 to col. 11, line 17. However, this is not the case. Rather, that passage states that the server receives a set of speech vectors and returns an answer to a question represented by the speech vectors. Neither this passage nor any other passage of Bennett indicates that a display device receives information from the server. Accordingly, for at least this reason, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 3, 5, 6 and 35 have been rejected as being anticipated by Braden-Harder (U.S. Patent No. 5,933,822). Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because Braden-Harder does not describe or suggest a display device that receives information sent by the server and includes means for storing the information sent from the server, as recited in claim 3; a display device that displays information sent by a server, as recited in claims 5 and 6; or displaying, by a display device, information sent by a server, as recited in claim 35.

While the action indicates that Braden-Harder shows a display that receives and stores or displays information sent from a server at col. 9, lines 1-67, this is not the case. Indeed, that passage does not even appear to describe a display device. In addition, Braden-Harder nowhere else indicates that a display device receives and stores or displays information from the server. Accordingly, for at least this reason, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 25-29 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Braden-Harder in view of Ramasubramani (U.S. Patent No. 6,516,316). Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because Braden-Harder, as noted above, does not describe or suggest having a display device display information sent by a server, as recited in claim 25, and because Ramasubramani does not remedy this failure of Braden-Harder.

Claims 7-12, 14-24, 31 and 32 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Braden-Harder in view of Ramasubramani and further in view of McAuliffe. Claims 8-12, 14 and 15 depend from claim 7, claims 17-24 depend from claim 16, and claims 31 and 32 depend from claim 25. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because neither Braden-Harder, Ramasubramani, McAuliffe nor any combination of the three describes or suggests having a display device display information sent from a server, as recited in claims 7 and 25; or having a server verify that information sent from the server to a display device was displayed on the display device, as recited in claim 16. In particular, since, as discussed above, none of the three references describes or suggests such interactions between a server and a display device, the combination of the three also fails to do so.

Claims 1 and 2 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Braden-Harder in view of Ramasubramani and further in view of Teare (U.S. Patent No. 6,151,624). Applicant requests

Applicant : Masaaki Hiroki  
Serial No. : 09/880,986  
Filed : June 13, 2001  
Page : 14 of 14

Attorney's Docket No.: 07977-278001 / US4986

reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because Braden-Harder and Ramasubramani, as noted above, do not describe or suggest having a display device receive information sent by a server, as recited in claims 1 and 2, and because Teare does not remedy this failure of Braden-Harder and Ramasubramani.

Applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance.

Enclosed is a \$450.00 check for the Petition for Extension of Time fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

2/9/05



John F. Hayden  
Reg. No. 37,640

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
1425 K Street, N.W.  
11th Floor  
Washington, DC 20005-3500  
Telephone: (202) 783-5070  
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331